

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are pending in this application. Claim 35 has been amended herein.

Amendments have been made to the specification to correct spelling errors.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention (Office action paragraphs 2-3).

The Examiner states that claim 11 recites that the material composing the device can be a I-VII compound, but that this is not supported by the specification.

The rejection of claim 11 is respectfully traversed. The recitation of "a I-VII group compound semiconductor" in claim 11 is supported by the disclosure of the specification on page 67, lines 1-3.

Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite (Office action paragraphs 5-9).

In paragraph 6 of the Office action, the Examiner states that claims 1 and 20 "show a potential gradient due to the piezoelectric effect but do not show under what bias conditions this gradient occurs." This remark appears to refer to the recitation "and having a strain generating a piezoelectric effect" in claim 1 on page 94, line 8 and in claim 20 on page 99, line 21, and the recitation in claim 20 of "a potential in said light emitting layer whose gradient is generated by said